REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the Application. The specification has been amended for a minor typographical error. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 102

1. Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6545122 (Elsner et al). The rejection should be withdrawn in view of the remarks below.

It is well settled that in order for a prior art reference to anticipate claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of claim with sufficient clarity to prove its existence in prior art. The disclosure requirement under 35 USC 102 presupposes knowledge of one skilled in art of claimed invention, but such presumed knowledge does not grant license to read into prior art reference teachings that are not there. See *Motorola Inc. v. Interdigital Technology Corp.* 43 USPQ2d 1481 (1997 CAFC). It is well-established that a 35 USC 102 rejection must rest upon the literal teachings of the reference and that the teachings must disclose every element of the claimed invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim (See. *Jamesbury Corp v. Litton Industrial Products, Inc.* 225 USPQ, 253, 256 (CAFC 1985); *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp* 218 USPQ 781, 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). The reference can be held to anticipate only that which is expressly disclosed and can be obtained by routine experimentation (*In re Sheppard 144 USPQ 42 (CCPA 1964)).*

Applicants' invention is related to a process for concentrating polymers by evaporation comprising (i) obtaining a mixture containing a polymer and volatile component, the volatile component being present in the mixture at an amount less than 20 wt.% relative to the weight of the mixture, and (ii) introducing the mixture in a downward direction under pressure through a plurality of nozzles arranged vertically and next to one another into a degassing container to form an extrudate, wherein the volatile component contains at least one member selected from the group consisting of residual monomers, oligomers and solvents, and wherein the throughput of the

mixture per nozzle is 0.3 to 2 kg/h, the vapor pressure of the volatile component of the extrudate is more than 2.5 bar, and the absolute pressure in the degassing container is 50 to 5000 Pa.

Applicants' invention includes a throughput of the mixtures in a range of 0.3 to 2 kg/h. Unexpectedly, the small polymer throughputs of, for example, but not limited to, 1 kg/h and 2 kg/h are advantageous for minimal residual contents of volatile components (Specification, Table 2). However, Elsner et al discloses a throughput of 5 to 30 kg/h (Col 4, lines 6 to 7 and Claim 1). Therefore, Elsner et al discloses values that are at a completely different range from that of Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Elsner et al does not disclose Applicants' invention. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 2-18 depend from Claim 1, which as discussed are believed to be allowable. Thus, Claims 2-18 are also believed to be allowable. Reconsideration is requested.

In view of the above amendments, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and the Examiner would be justified in allowing them.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jill Denesvich
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 52,810

LANXESS Corporation
Law & Intellectual Property Department
111 RIDC Park West Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 809-2232
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 809-1054

\sr\S:\Law Shared\SHARED\JD\PATENTS\7833\7833 amend FAX 6-8-05 .doc